# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

#### **FISCAL NOTE**

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 3966-01

Bill No.: Perfected HB 1627

Subject: Counties: Building Codes

Type: Original Date: April 25, 2002

# **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS							
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005				
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0				

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS							
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005				
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0				

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS						
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005			
<b>Local Government</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0			

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

WB:LR:OD (12/01)

L.R. No. 3966-01 Bill No. Perfected HB 1627 Page 2 of 4 April 25, 2002

#### **ASSUMPTION**

Officials of the **Office of Administration- Division of Design and Construction** assume there would be no fiscal impact.

Officials of **Jefferson County** assume no fiscal impact.

In response to similar legislation from last session, (HB 185), the following statements were submitted:

Officials of **Christian**, **Polk**, and **Adair Counties** (third class counties) stated that this proposal is optional for third class counties, however, should the County Commission, with voter approval adopt building regulations the county would realize fiscal impact. Officials estimated income from fees, licenses, and permits which would defray the costs of enforcement and administration.

The **Stone County Commission (third class county)** assume there would be no fiscal impact unless the County Commission, or a petition submitted to the Commission, would receive voter approval to adopt building regulations.

Oversight assumes this proposal is permissive and would have no state fiscal impact. Counties would have no fiscal impact without action by their County Commission, with voter approval. If a county were to establish building regulations under this proposal, the county could expect to receive income from permits, licenses, and inspection fees, and costs from code enforcement, and administration. Since this proposal does not mandate counties to establish building codes and regulations Oversight assumes no fiscal impact.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2003 (10 Mo.)	FY 2004	FY 2005
	\$0	\$0	\$0
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2003 (10 Mo.)	FY 2004	FY 2005
	\$0	\$0	\$0

#### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

Small businesses that are located in a county that would adopt a building and electrical code of regulation could expect to be impacted to the extent that if they were to build or improve

WB:LR:OD (12/01)

L.R. No. 3966-01 Bill No. Perfected HB 1627 Page 3 of 4 April 25, 2002

buildings on their property, they would pay fees for permits, inspections, etc.

#### **DESCRIPTION**

Under current law, the County Commission in counties of the first and second classification may adopt building regulations by ordinance. This bill allows County Commissions in third classification counties to also adopt such regulations. The building regulations may include the issuance of building permits, inspection of electrical wiring, and the licensing of persons engaged in the business of electrical wiring.

The County Commission of a county of the third classification must appoint a building commission if a valid petition is submitted by the qualified voters of the affected area. The building commission is required to prepare a building and electrical code of regulations, which must be submitted to the County Commission for adoption and to the voters of the affected area for approval.

Any building ordinance adopted applies to the erection, remodeling, or addition of building structures, but does not apply to farm structures unless they are used as a residence. Ordinances adopted under the bill cannot apply to land use.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

#### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of Administration- Division of Design and Construction Jefferson County Commission Christian County Commission Polk County Commission Adair County Commission Stone County Commission

## NOT RESPONDING

The County Commissions of : Callaway, Pulaski, Pettis, Warren, Wright, Marion, Washington, Gasconade, and Ste. Geneieve

WB:LR:OD (12/01)

L.R. No. 3966-01 Bill No. Perfected HB 1627 Page 4 of 4 April 25, 2002

> Mickey Wilson, CPA Acting Director April 25, 2002